Adm. F IX-4

193
(Jul)

Previous References
Jul 29 B 1-3
11 G 1 — 25 B 3-8
2 B 25 B 1-2
~~Earlier References~~ B 1 8
64-04 B 1-3
Jul 62 10 B V-10
Later Ref. Jul 98 37 6
Jul 22-41-43 ' 1
22-42-24

Serial No.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial No. 19

Part B for December 1936

SUBJECT

Papers relating to the assassination.
Palace Responsibility

WD 0418—GI B— 2 500—29-8 36

Papers file

Serial No

A

9) Palace Appartabh and Dobbspet are situate in the area within which the Govt notification of 2nd July 1892 is operative That notification prohibits the erection of new buildings of any kind whatsoever (including extensions of existing buildings) within the area defined therein

10) Both the Under Secy, Prot Branch and the Government Advocate, to whom the matter was referred have held the notification to have the force of law and that under it the officers of Govt & the Municipality are bound to see that due effect is given to the prohibition. It is therefore legally possible to prohibit the construction of new buildings in the locality

11) But the prohibition does not seem to extend to mere repair of existing houses It is only the extension of existing buildings that is prohibited by the notification. Owners of existing houses cannot therefore be prevented from repairing their premises so long as such repair does not amount to erection of a building as defined [illegible] of the Act

14) It has been held that the notifications impose no restriction on the improvement of existing houses but only on the erection of new buildings and extensions of existing buildings vide Thos D'Rose Esqr, No 2 1076 Dy 24-8-27 to the Municipal Commissioner

G

[illegible] 30/3

the locality [illegible] 2 however may [illegible] the fencing of [illegible] wherein

under clause 116, Govt have reserved powers to prohibit the ~~etc~~ erection of buildings in certain areas without previous permission of Govt.

214/Law

13) As regards the question of improving the locality, kind reference is invited to the orders of the Dewan passed on 24th August 1927 [after an inspection of the locality

Asst Secy, PWD
with comps

PWD 29/3

— in MB file 81 G of 1925 (SCS 1-2)

Send for orders

15) The scheme prepared by the Municipal Council for the improvement of the locality by acquiring properties, as suggested in this Office letter no 2107G/ME 81 25 of 24 8 27, has not been given effect to as the request of the MCC for Govt financing the whole scheme — at a cost of nearly Rs 26000 — was not sanctioned by Govt

G

(16) (Gen Secy) Asst 3/3

Two ~~Three~~ Questions have been raised in the Dewan minute of 25.3.33 The answers are as follows —

amendment

(1) Its legally possible to prohibit the construction of new houses but not the repairing of existing ones — more

(2) As the Law now stands, nothing is possible But when the Municipal Bill

Serial No

Now before the Legislature becomes law, house building may be totally prohibited on the area & the Govt, all those who have acquired any right which now they are precluded from exercising will have to be adequately compensated—

17) May the suggestion be made that the Palace authorities may acquire the area & keep it in their possession—

RG
31/3/33

II nd member of Dewan.

ultra legislature
[illegible]
[illegible] (2) above
[illegible]

File No | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 193

18) The City Municipal Bill when it becomes law will set at rest the many doubts now felt in some quarters regarding the power to prohibit construction of buildings in this area under the Notification of 1892. But the construction of buildings on lands set apart as building sites either by Govt or the Mcty prior to taking action under the new law cannot be prevented. If total prohibition in the area is desired the only course seems to be to acquire it for the Palace

AS

19) Please speak Rs

23/9/11

20) The Chief Secy wants to see the discussions in the Select Comtee on the City Mcty Bill relating to the introduction of the provision in Sec 11B of the Regulation

21) The copy of the Select Comtee report & of the Mcty relating to the discussion of the question whether Canal may be filled up

22) A copy of the Select Committee Report Secy 10

Report on the Nagpur city water
bill is putup (vide flag A for
the portion regd to — see 116 of the Regn)

23) The proceedings of the L.C. of
June 1932 is putup, and refers
-ences to the discussion of the Bill
in pages 135–155 & 182–216 thereof
There does not appear to be any particular
reference to this point in the proceedings
And reference is also made to the
discussions in the Assembly debates
in the subject (copy has been putup
in connection with the system of
Communal representation in city wards)
Section of the Nagpur city municipal in the subject and referred)

Sna
8/10/32.

Chief Secy)
24)

Asm
8/10

14/10/32

25) The file is revised as directed today. For the
Chief Secy's note already putup, please see formal note sheet below

Chief Secy)

Asm
17/11

[illegible]
VI 1933

E

Serial No

26) Under the Government Notification of 2nd July 1892 the erection of new buildings of any kind whatsoever (including extensions of existing buildings) within the area in question was prohibited The prohibition did not however extend to the repairs of existing buildings

27) Under section 116 of the City Municipalities Regulation which came into force from 1st August 1933, Government can by notification published in the Gazette prohibit the erection of buildings in a specified area except with permission granted by Government in this behalf This provision is however subject to a proviso in the case of lands already set apart as building sites that the permission referred to shall not be refused

28) So, whether under the Notification of 2nd July 1892 or under the proviso to Section 116 of the new Regulation permission to rebuild or repair already existing houses cannot be refused

29) If the intention is to secure complete prohibition of the erection of buildings in the area and even the repairs of existing buildings the only course possible appears to be to acquire the whole area for the Palace by paying compensation to the owners

E339/6/1

RS 6/4/34

Dewan

RS 6/4/34

6/1

File No of 193

General and Revenu
Secretariat

Serial No

DEWAN'S MINUTE 3109

FILE No 193

31) Major Sacy's letter is based on the suggestions made by me. But I do not know if Rs 500/- could be found for the purpose as much of the detail amounts to my ideas & suggestions. But the land that was acquired should be taken over by the Palace authorities promptly & a fencing round the Palace ground should be put up. Then the building area on the land again should pay special attention to the same.

2nd The general scheme may also now be drawn up by the Palace Engineer showing the roads which are new roads should be allowed the contractor & the localities the main scheme may be carried out later on if Govt can provide funds, or the Palace might go on with this portion by itself, if they like

DEWAN'S OFFICE 5 APR 1934 No 6785

(Sd) Second Member

6-4-34

3rd) JDZ 6/4

- 4 Ms

UWW 7.4.34

MrSS 30 Please go through the Palace Engineer

The Palace,

Mysore, 15th March 1934

Sir Mirza Ismail,

The village of Upparahally is an eyesore in the very heart of an important portion of the City and it may be more desirable to acquire it than to improve it. When I was in Bangalore on the 9th instant, Mr Krishna Rao, Commissioner, Bangalore City Municipality, informed me that it would approximately cost Rs80,000/- to acquire the whole village The amount being large, the acquisition may be done gradually and completed in the course of eight years spending Rs10,000/- annually for the purpose I am to state in this connection that the Palace will be prepared to contribute a moiety of the cost of acquisition by paying every year Rs5,000/- if the Government is willing to bear the other half and to treat the property acquired as belonging to the Palace

The file which you handed to me in person is returned herewith with thanks

Yours sincerely,

Amin-ul-Mulk

Sir Mirza M.Ismail, Kt, C I E, O B E

Dewan of Mysore, Bangalore

Construction of houses in Palace Uppanahalli and Doddpet Bangalore

3109 - 24

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 193 | [App F III—2

Serial No

36) Replies are due in this file in respect of the following -

(1) Municipal Comr's letter no 9 To 152 dy 28/1/30 and his D O letter no 9 TO 185 dy 12/2/1932 regarding the legality of the prohibition contained in the Govt notifications of 1892

(2) Petition dy 25333 presented to the Dewan by Mr Lakshminarasu on behalf of the residents of Palace Uppanahalli & Doddpet

Please put up Draft replies on the basis of the orders in the file

11/4

37) Submitted with two drafts for approval

16 4 34

38) The two Drafts are for consideration, Please see para 3 of Dewans minute dy 5 4 34

17/4

Chief Secy

39) Please speak to me

RG 17/4/34

40) The Chief Secy wants the question to be examined as whether the notification of 1892 should not be treated as having been repealed by the provision in Sec 116 of the Cattle Trespass Regulation

41) Please put up for recn the Discussions in regard to this provision in the Select Comtee & the Legle Council

A

WD 0494—GPB—15 000—13-10-33

Construction of houses near Palaces upparahalli & Dobbspet roads

3/89

3/89

W

File No | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No

K

J-

The Select Committee's report on the Prop. & reports made on notifications dtd 1892 etc

The report of the Select Committee and the copies of the L C Proceedings containing the discussions regarding the City Municipalities Bill are sent up as directed

43) For favour of opinion on the point raised at A on the last page

Advocate General / Law Secretary / War Camps

19/4/34 AV

24/4

44 In para II of the notification of 2nd July 1892, the orders of Govt dated the 7th Oct 1887 ~~regard~~ prohibiting the erection of new buildings etc in Palace Upparahalli & Dobbspet areas have been duly notified "for general information and strict guidance". Both the Govt Advocate & the Under Secy Prot have held that this notification has the force of law. If so, there is nothing to indicate that it is in any way repealed or otherwise dealt with ~~under~~ by the City Municipalities Regn of 1933

45) It is true that in sec 116 of this Regn power has been taken by Govt to issue similar notifications with respect to ~~any~~ any area within a City Municipality But this cannot affect the legality or otherwise of a notification already issued. ~~It is at best the new provision may be~~ The fact that the Legislature thought fit to make a specific provision enabling Govt to issue such a notification, may at best be used as

Serial No

an argument to indicate that in the absence of such a provn, govt had not that power and consequently the ~~question~~ point as to the notn of 1892 having the force of law may thus be doubted. The effect of sec 116 of the Cchs Municipalities Regns is therefore not to repeal ~~the~~ the notn of 1892 but ~~the Question of a doubt~~ to give some room to doubt the legality of the notn even at the time it was first issued

46) I think the reason why sec 116 was introduced was to ~~remove doubts as to the powers~~ because the power of govt to prohibit the erection of buildings in an area by means of an executive order was doubted. Consequently ~~to~~ to expedite it was found desirable to expressly invest in govt such power In these circumstances it does not appear desirable now to rely merely on the notn of 1892 for prohibiting the construction of buildings in the area in question The safer course is to issue now a notification with respect to this area under sec 116 of the new Regulations, and then cancel the notn of 1892.

364 Laws

Asst Secy L&G
with Compts

1874
5/5/34

Chief Secy)

7/5

BRIEF SECRETARY
7 MAY 1934

590 f 635

3177

515 f 2

File No	of 193	General and Revenue Secretariat
		Serial No

The file bearing to the issue of the notification of 2nd July 892 may cannot be put up The chief Secy wants a further examination of the question whether a party who is prevented from burning on his own land under the said notn is not entitled to claim Compensation

Asst Secy 8/5/3c
Home Comptt

Please put up the file

5) Please see pages 3 7 & 8 of the notes in the file 81 25 (581 2) placed below, which show that the file connected with the notifn of 1892 is not available either in the Genl Records or in the P W Section -

Asst Secy, Lawson
Home Comptt

Serial No

57 The Notification dated the 2nd July 1892 was issued in pursuance of an order of Government of the same date passed with reference to the communication from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, regarding the localities in Bangalore City where house building [illegible] prohibited The order runs thus:-

57 "The Government of His Highness the Maharaja resolve to issue the following notification on the subject of the Deputy Commissioner's communication above cited:-"

57 In para (2) of the Notification which follows this order, the Chief Commissioner's Notification No 188 dated 24th Octr 1874 is republished This Chief Commissioner's Notification was, in turn, a republication of a previous notification of the same officer issued on 23rd April 1866" It defines "the boundaries of the ground reserved for public purposes near the Government Offices and the Division Cutchery at Bangalore and prohibited within that area "the erection of any building without distinct permission from the Mysore Government" It is clear from a perusal of the boundaries that the whole area covered by this notification for each part of Government lands was reserved for public purposes It was apparent even before that this notification did not interfere with or restrict in any way the enjoyment of private rights within the area beyond the area being reserved for public purposes, so that private rights could have accrued [illegible] it is

can withdraw hard file (3 documents)

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

of the Chief Commissioner simply had the effect of prohibiting any such private rights to accrue thereafter There is no need therefore to canvass any arguments for giving the force of law to this notification The Chief Commissioner under the Revenue Law had sufficient powers to reserve Government lands for public purposes and to prohibit private rights accruing therein In issuing the notification of 1868 the Chief Commissioner was not therefore making any new law but only passing an executive order which he was entitled to do

When the chief Com^{r} had to issue a notification having the force of law, he had always to obtain the consent + sanction of the Governor-in-Council - ME 2/6

In para (2) of the Notification of 2nd July 1892 referred to above, it is stated as follows --

"It is further hereby notified for general information and strict guidance that by orders of Government dated the 7th October 1887, the erection of new buildings on any account whatsoever including extensions of existing buildings is prohibited within the area enclosed by a boundary line as follows - × × ×

× (This includes Palace Approach + Hospital)

The Notification of 1892 was therefore in this respect again a republication of the orders of Government of 1887 It is a pity that no copy of that order is procurable and it has not been possible even to get at the file on any other reference leading to the issue of the Notification of 1892 The language of the Notification itself, however, shows clearly that it was a Notification which emanated from the Government and not directly from His Highness as the sovereign authority for

Serial No

for the State and the source ~~for sole~~ of all legislative powers therein" It is highly doubtful therefore whether it is possible now to construe this notification as having the force of law It may be, after all that the area of Upparahalli and Dobspet covered by this Notification was an area which did not vest in the Municipality though it was included within the City Municipal Limits It might have consisted only of agricultural lands paying revenue to Governmen and as such Government had every power to grant or refuse permission to build, or to pass such other necessary orders as they ~~may~~ deem fit in respect of buildings constructed thereon Even now from the plan it appears that the major portion of this area consists of agricultural lands paying revenue to Government

15 In this connection, para (3) of this Notification of 1892 appears significant It runs as follows

'On lands assigned for public purposes, whether within or without the boundaries prescribed in the ~~prescribed~~ preceding paragraphs, no new buildings or extensions of the existing ones shall be erected without the express previous sanction of Government "

16 This appears to be nothing but an exercise of the power vested in Government under Section 39 of the Land Revenue Code, and it may be that the G O of 1887 was but an exercise of this power of reserving the

~~[illegible]~~

Serial No

the entire area for public purposes - In this view, it is necessary to find out by a reference to the - Deputy Commissioner and to the Old revenue records - how private rights were allowed to accrue in this area

9 Whether or not, the notification of 2nd July 1892 has the force of law, it is clear that it cannot be construed as empowering Government to expropriate private property or to restrict rights to such property within the area without at the same time giving reasonable compensation to the aggrieved party Such a construction is not warranted by the language of the notification, and it is clear that it is too late now to claim any royal prerogatives in this behalf

As observed in the recent full Bench case of our High Court, in Criminal Revision Petition No 192 of 1932-33

"In a constitutional and enlightened Government inspired by English conceptions of law and justice, there is the supremacy or predominance of regular law as opposed to the influence of arbitrary power on the part of the Government

In England in the famous case of Attorney-General VS DeKeyser's Hotel, (1920 Appeal Cases 508) a prerogative right was boldly asserted to seize and occupy the lands of a subject if required for the defence of the realm without any obligation to pay compensation to the owner save as an act of grace

5767

[App F III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No | of 193

Serial No

The House of Lords rejected this claim of the Crown It was held that even if a prerogative right of so extended a nature had ~~been existing~~ ever existed, when a series of statutes had provided machinery whereby the Crown was enabled to take possession of such lands as may be necessary for public purposes, or if need be, to interfere with private rights by compulsion, but always on payment of compensation, the constitutional principle is that when the power of the executive to interfere with ~~the~~ private property has been ~~so~~ controlled & regulated by a statute, the Executive no longer derives its authority from the royal prerogative but that in exercising such authority, the Executive Government is bound to observe the restrictions which the statutes have imposed in favour of the subject In this view, it has to be ~~extended~~ held that after the passing of the Municipal Regulation and especially the City Municipalities Regulation of 1933 and the Land Acquisition Regulations, Government cannot prevent a person holding land and having rights to build thereon, from exercising his rights unless Government acquire the lands and the rights of the owner thereof by paying suitable compensation to him

*(Vide sec 116)

394/Laws

6. The matter is one of importance and if approved, the Govt Advocate will be further consulted unofficially

(Chief Secy)

5 JUNE

2/6

WD 0484—GPB—15 000—12-10-38

5962

File No of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

Serial No 374

2 0 No p 10 7 34 Date 20 7-34

Forwarded with compliments to the Govt Advocate for favour of opinion

Mysore Rao
20/7/34

No Do 51/34-35 dt 23/7/34

GOVT ADVOCATE'S OFFICE
JULY 1934
COLOMBO

No Do 38/34-35 dt 25-7-34

Returned with compliments

(5) The points that are now raised are -

(1) Whether the Notification of 1892 should not be deemed to have been repealed by Section 116 of the New Regulation a n d

(2) whether a party who is prevented from building on his own land under the above Notification is not entitled to claim compensation

In his note the Assistant Secretary has referred to the history of this Notification in detail and has also pointed out that the questions have become complicated as the previous references are no available

Regarding the first point, it has been pointed out already that the No ification of 1892 has the force of law and as such can be enforced by Government The new Municipal Regulation does not expressly repeal it and as it is not in any way inconsistent with Section 116 it cannot be deemed to have been repealed by necessary implication

The answer to the 2nd point depends on whether the private rights were acquired prior to or subsequent to the Notification in question If

the

Serial No

the owners of these lands had acquired full proprietory rights prior to the Notification it would be unjust or inequitable to restrict their rights without adequately compensating them as it would be a confiscation of those rights by the State If, however, they acquired the rights after the issue of the Notification they would only acquire a restricted right i e a right curtailed by the terms of the Notification and would not seem to be entitled to any compensation

SSMudaliyar 24/9
Government Advocate

CSN/24 9 34

Chief Secy) SSP 25/9/34

by Submitted for perusal

Dewan

case 27 9 34 ot

65) Please ask M C what action he does suggest be taken in the matter in view of the G Cs opinion SSP 28/9 MS 29/9
MS
29-9-34

66) May we please be sent to the relevant notes RS 1/10 MS 1/10

Chief Secy 1/10/34 MS 1/10/34

67) Yes 1/10

CE
SEPT 1934
No 1952

File No | of 193 | General and Revenue Secretariat

Forwarded with compliments unofficially to the Municipal Commr Bangalore city for favour of remarks (Ref Para 65 Supra)

2 10 W 79-34
Dy 4-10-34

Do

Achuta Rao
For chief Secy to Govt
4 10 3

69 Returned with compliments I very much regret the delay in returning the file which is due to the fact that the papers had been misplaced and were traced recently

70 Referring to the opinion of the Government Advocate at para 63 supra there is evidence that houses did exist on the present site of Chickka Upparahalli and Dodda Upparahalli as far back as 1885 and possibly even prior to that year In 1885 Dr Mc Gann the then Senior Surgeon and Sanitary Commissioner urged the City Municipal Council to shift these two villages as they were polluting the water of Miller's tank which supplied drinking water to the surrounding localities The City Municipality agreed to this suggestion The C & M Station Commission had agreed to contribute a sum of Rs 5000/- towards the cost of compensation and the Deputy Commissioner submitted to Government a valuation statement for Rs 36,205/- for acquiring the houses in these two villages However 72 protected water supply was introduced the idea of shifting the villages appears to have been abandoned

71 Among the papers in the linked file, there is a copy of a map showing the areas of Bangalore City and C & M Station Municipalitie in 1894 On this map the village site occupied by houses in Dodda-Upparahalli and Chickka Upparahalli has been marked The Govern e t Notification prohibiting buildings in Dodda Upparahalli and Chick a-

SUBJECT IN BRIEF

NOTES AND ORDERS

Chikka Upparahalli was promalgated in the year 1892 Most of the houses that we see at present must have existed prior to the issue of the notification referred to above It seems almost certain that the owners of buildings and vacant sites had acquired full proprietary rights in respect of these sites prior to the notification As long ago as 1885, a proposal was advarced for acquiring the houses and the compensation payable was estimated at Rs 30,204 Apart from the question of the legality or otherwise of such a step, it seems, that on considerations of fairness and equity, that the owners ought to be paid compensation if they are to be deprived of the use of their sites or houses

72 The present position according to the existing orders of Government is that permission may be granted for the improvement or repair of existing houses but not for extending them nor for building new houses The question of compensation arises only in respect of vacant sites on which the owners are not permitted to build I had the village surveyed last week A plan of the village showing the different types of houses and vacant spaces as they now exist has been prepared A copy of the plan is put up It appears that there are 16 private vacant sites in DoddaUpparahalli, 13 vacant sites in ChickkaUpparahalli or 29 in all We neither permit the owners to build on the sites nor have we acquired them Most of the owners of these are poor people living on daily wages and the restriction has hit them hard

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISIONER, BANGALORE CITY

File No *of 193*

SUBJECT IN BRIEF

NOTES AND ORDERS

The only remedy seems to be to acquire these vacant sites and give them sites elsewhere The compensation payable will not, I believe, exceed Rs 5000/- This step will effectively prevent new houses from coming up If this suggestion finds favour with Government necessary action will be taken at once

73 This will not, I am afraid, solve the problem arising out of the existence of the village in this prominent locality The only solution appears to be to shift the entire village to another suitable site not very far away An attempt was made in this direction as far back as 1885 on the suggestion of Dr J C Gann The cost was estimated at about Rs 30,000 But this idea was subsequently abandoned The question came into prominence again in 1913 In August of that year Government asked the President of the Municipality to submit a scheme for the improvement of Upparahalli and Dobspet In April 1915 a scheme costing Rs 74,000 for setting back the two villages for laying out regular roads, for removing congestion and for a sewage system was submitted to Government Government sanctioned the scheme and agreed to contribute half of the cost vide G O No 9200-2/M 1 42-13-9 dated 23rd March 1916 The Municipality agreed after some correspondence, to bear the other half of the cost of the scheme In August 1919 Government sanctioned detailed estimates amounting to Rs 69,270 for the improvements to the village vide G.O No. 2810-12/M1 3-19-4 dated 26th August 1919. But does not appear to have been put into effect

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISIONER BANGALORE CITY

File No *of 193*

SUBJECT IN BRIEF

NOTES AND ORDERS

execution possibly for want of funds

74 In 1927, Government asked the Municipal Commissioner to submit proposals for improving Upparahalli by opening out congested areas and widening/lanes wherever recessary In 1928, the Municipal Commissioner submitted to Government proposals costing Rs 25851for these improvements. On the suggestion of the Chief Engineer, the estimate was revised to Rs 28,518 As the Municipal Council desired that the entire cost may be met by Government the proposals were not sanctioned

75 With a view to have correct data, the villages of Upparahalli surveyed A copy of the plan accompanies In Doddaupparahalli there are 24 mangalore tiled houses, 31 mud roofed houses, 8 country tiled buildings, 8 thatched sheds and 16 vacant sites Chickkaupparahalli contains 29 mangalore tiled houses, 13 mudroofed buildings 6 country tiled buildings and 13 vacant sites Valuation statements prepared separately for each of these villages also accompanies The total cost of acquisition of the entire village is estimated at about Rs. 84,000, inclusive of the statutory allowance

76 The people whose houses are acquired will have to be housed elsewhere There is a very large area between the Sankey's tank bund and the road from Guttahalli to Malleswaram The ground rises from the last road in Malleswaram gradually up to the Parsi cemetry The area is eminently suited for building purposes being surrounded on all sides by important roads The area referred to

BANGALORE CITY MUNICIPALITY

OFFICE OF THE MUNICIPAL COMMISIONER, BANGALORE CITY

File No *of 193*

SUBJECT IN BRIEF

NOTES AND ORDERS

is marked "A" in blue pencil on the a companying plan, (No 2) It consists of dry lands used for agricultural purposes The cost of acquisition is not expected to be heavy The owners are already thinking of converting these lands into building sites This large area may be acquired for being laid out as an extension About a third of this area will be sufficient to house the people of Upparahalli The dispossessed people may be given sites for their sites and cash compensation for the super structures Sooner or later the Municipality will have to take up the scheme and these proposals may be worked into the general scheme of making an extension in the locality If they are moved here the people of Upparahalli will not be very far away from their present abode The Government will have to meet the entire cost of acquisition of houses and the Municipality may perhaps be expected to allot sites for the displaced people in the area referred to above, free of cost, this being treated as the contribution of the Municipality towards the scheme

CHIEF SECRETARY
25 MAR 1936

Meikadru
25/3/36

Serial No

77) Subs with reference to Dewans orders in para 65 Supra.

The measures suggested by the Municipal Commissioner are —

(1) To acquire vacant sites in the area and give the owners sites elsewhere The cost of acquisition is estimated at Rs 5000/

This is suggested only as a partial remedy as only the construction of new houses will be prevented by this, while the existing structures remain

Or

(2) To acquire the whole area and shift the entire village to a site ⊕ between the Sankey Tank bund and the road from Gottahalli to Malleswaram The cost of acquisition of the vacant lands & houses in the area is estimated at Rs 84,000. The Com^r thinks that this will be a satisfactory solution of the problem

⊕ Vide portion marked A in Plan 2

78 The cost of acquisition is proposed to be met by Govt

79 It is stated that the Mys Govt have now to take up the question of laying out a new site referred to above as an extension and that a third of the area will suppose to

WD 03 94—GPB—80 000—18-7-35

Prohibition of the construction of buildings in Palace Uppamhalli Bangalore city

File No of 193 General and Revenue Secretariat

have the dispossessed people of Uppamhalli. The Com says that cash compensation may be given only in respect of superstructures, new sites being given to the owners in exchange for the old, in the new area proposed. The idea seems to be that the Municipality will acquire the latter at their cost, but will give sites free of cost to the dispossessed persons of Uppamhalli, thus reducing the cost of acquisition to a sum which will be limited to the compensation payable for the buildings

Yours

Chiefsecy)

App 26/3

CHIEF SECRETARY
26 MAR 1936

50) The acq[n] of the Uppamhalli in full and the ~~Separate~~ acq[n] & laying out of the extension to the ~~East~~ South of the Sankey Road (Between Guttahalli & Malleswaram) may be taken up as a combined scheme by the Govt on an advanced account. This will enable Govt to grant sites in exchange & settle the population displaced from Uppamhalli & also facilitate recovery of loans on Uppamhalli by any profits on the new Extension

Prohibition of the construction of buildings in Palace Upparahalli, Bangalore city

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No 3109/L(33-34) of 193 | [App F III—2

Serial No

21) The disposal of the ground on which Upparahalli stands to the Palace, or otherwise may be separately dealt with, after the scheme is Completed

2 8 3 36

2nd member & Dewan

7461

GA for personal inspection on the 4th or 6th inst

22) The acquisition of the properties in Upparahalli may be taken up when consequent of the extra revenue from impost. Perhaps a beginning may be made with the contribution of Rs 5000 per year promised by the Palace could be raised to Rs 10000 for 4 years, the cost in subsequent years being met by Govt.

8/4/36

23) 8/4

Fin Secy

9/4

24) There will be no change on the State funds for the next 4 years according to the above proposals - minute - So I have nothing to say at this stage of the cost of acquisition of shares, the area acquired should also be shared between the Govt and the

15/4/36

F DEWAN F OE 6153

FINANCIAL SECRETARY'S OFFICE 2603 11 APR 1936

WD 03694—GPB—80,000—18-7-35

Acqn of Palace Equipments

File No 3109 32 of 193

General and Revenue Secretariat

85 Repe – Dewans minute para 65–above

Dewan)

62-91

16-4-36

To 16/4

To N S may be consulted on this & the file being sent them

MJ
22 4-36

22 4 36

To 24/4

87 Forwarded with compliments unofficially to the Huzur Secretary to His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore for favour of remarks

No D145-35
Dt 23-4-36

By order

Chief Secretary to Govt

Rmr

No 1174
1 file

Returned with compliments

86 As there is a budget deficit this year, the consideration of the question may be deferred to next year

1038

Palace, Mysore,
13-10-1936

Huzur Secretary

Dt for perusal

2789

2nd member
Dewan
Pal up a Bk
and move please 90 RM

16/10/36

17/10/36

18/10/36

MJ
23-10-36

24/10/36

26/10/36

Incorporation of Palace Appanahalli Bangalore city

General and Revenue Secretariat | MC File No 3109/33 | 2607 of 1936 | [App E III—2

Serial No	
92	Submitted with reference to para 91 supra Rmr 4/11/36 4/11/36
	(Ch Secy) (Dewan) MRS 5/11/36 5/11/36
	Mrs Law ors for perusal 13-11-36 MRS 14/11/36
	Draft letter to the Municipal Comrs, returning the office file of papers as submitted for approval Rmr 17/11 17/11/36
	To the MC Comrs, Bangalore city No L 3709 dated 20-11-36 Returns the office file of papers & requests them to acknowledge the receipt thereof- Letter No L Dis RL Rg 6526/36-37 dated 3-12-36 from the Municipal Comrs, Bangalore city acknowledging the receipt of his file Submitted for perusal & approval the papers 14/12/36

6 NOV 1936
1200
13 DEC 1936

File No	of 193	General and Revenue Secretariat
		Serial No

To

[illegible] Sir [illegible]irza [illegible] Is[illegible], [illegible]

[illegible] of [illegible]ysor[illegible]

[illegible]

Honoured Sir,

[illegible] of [illegible]

[illegible] city [illegible] respectfully [illegible]

[illegible]et

[illegible] is [illegible] ous

[illegible] Palace [illegible] Subb[illegible]

[illegible] it [illegible] City [illegible]

[illegible] city [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

City [illegible] subject to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

proper [illegible]

Bangalore City [illegible] re-

construct their [illegible] ers

plans, but for [illegible]

[illegible] The Municipality has been [illegible]

Palace

Palace Irrespholli and Dottapet [illegible] than prohibited
area.

Some few [illegible] persons [illegible] obtained permission, or, [illegible] to build while the site situated and building on the existing ground floor [illegible] overlooked or ill-planned the [illegible] to [illegible] have their holdings enough to construct new houses by the large advantage of [illegible] facilities [illegible] result on the part of the municipal Executive but the great majority of the residents [illegible] are timid and do not care to get rid of the clutches of the municipal C[illegible]rials of face legal proceedings have been patiently [illegible] the [illegible] imposed upon them by the municipal act on account of the unreality [illegible] building [illegible] persons [illegible] are clinging to their ancestral homes [illegible] people and [illegible] ye[illegible] only hoping that relief will come one day.

The memorialists [illegible] their [illegible] and [illegible] on about 10-12-1913 letters were addressed to the Government of Mysore by the Commissioner [illegible] and Municipality on the subject of [illegible] the Palace Irrespholli and Dottapet [illegible] on certain lines and a [illegible] proposed [illegible] [illegible] was passed in or about August 1910 by the Secretary to the Government of Mysore sanctioning a scheme for the improvement of the above areas. The scheme has however not [illegible] some reason not [illegible] to the Public.

As late as August 1931 the question of granting [illegible] to build [illegible] above [illegible] came up for consideration before the City Municipal Council and it would appear that [illegible] whole question and in accordance [illegible] the [illegible] Committee of the Council [illegible] passed by the Municipal Council that [illegible] to

to refu e li enses to the applicants in the said a eas
In t is connection the me oli list umbly beg to invite
you attention to some co e pondence nd editorial matter
t appeared in The Daily ost ang lore ealing with
the above subject uttings o re Paper e nexed
hereto

In spite of the above e olution p sed by the -
Muni pal Counc l the uricipal Executiv have been -
cont nuing o i sue endo semen re ewing licen es to build
on the sa e c oun , not Palac Upper h lli ni Dobbspet are
w in p ohibited a eas The hie obstacle standing in
the ay of the unic pal executive ar ne lic nces appears
to be a oli Chie Co mi sioner s not ca ion clarifying
the above a eas a p ohibited- pre ently o building
purposes n teve i r t n v t n the i e ons not
existed at the time o such a otification it is respect-
ully sub itted th t the same do not exist t the presen d y
Save Upp r lli and Dobbspet all the othe areas which had
been declared to be prohibited areas ir t e Chie Commi sion-
er's Noti ication ha v since b n ormed into extensions
It is un ortunate that only ou loc lity should still be
treat d as a p ohibited area

It is also sub itted th t such a Notification would
not be binding on th ov ent eliminist ation but les any
technical di ficul ies a y ea on o ne notificat on
being
aing ispo ed o i A o al y e ried m mo iali ta
y t en l is may be to p rescind the pre e
Noti ication i c Chie Co mis io e reat r ve
to the uni i lit y t e Gove n nt to olu le i -
sion to build o the i iac s o the d ad

The memorialists are p epared to furnish any ac ount e
approved by the Covernm t o the Muricipality and

[illegible] they are
[illegible] and
[illegible] -
[illegible]

The [illegible]

We beg to remain

Honoured Sir

Your Most Obedient Servants

S Lakshminarasu

(Sd) S Lakshminarasu

For the Residents of Palace Upparpalli
and Dobbspet Bangalore City

Bangalore
25th March 1933

CORRESPONDENCE

(The Editor does not undertake any responsibility for the opinions expressed by Correspondents)

OUR ANCIENT RUINS

(TO THE EDITOR DAILY POST)

Sir —It is matter of common knowledge that the owners of properties in the Palace Uppar halli and Dobbspet areas within the Municipal limits of Bangalore City have been residing in squalid and ill conditioned houses existing in the said areas built by their ancestors some decades if not centuries ago putting up with the insanitary and dangerous state of their dwellings and facing pestilence and death every hour yet clinging fondly to their home expecting deliverance from the powers that be

Time and again the residents of the aforesaid localities have been petitioning to the Bangalore City Municipality not only for a general improvement of that part of Bangalore but also for permission to renew or rebuild their dilapidated homes or for construction new residences on proper plans The endorsements that are being given by the Municipality for more than forty years past make a sorry story but it must be told

Prior to the Great War and till the year 1919 a bogey of Prohibited area was trotted out by the City Municipality and formed the basis for their refusing permission not only for building new but even for improving houses that were in a bad state of repair Several of these houses have now fallen and levelled up with the ground, and our Municipality may take solace in the fact that dead houses like dead men can tell no tales

In the one or two instances where they did grant permission to repair the owners were compelled to rebuild on the existing foundations however ancient both in material and in conception they might have been

Whence the bogey of Prohibited area was born for what purposes and till what period of time the said areas were to be deemed prohibited is still a moot point how any form or validity was given to it and in exercise of what powers (questionable or unquestionable) the Bangalore City Municipality sought to enforce the same is also a point in question

However that may be there appears to have taken shape in 1919 as evidenced by an order in August of that year by the Secretary to the Government of Mysore a proposal of the Municipality with the sanction of the Government for improvement of Palace Uppatahalli and Dobbspet areas on certain lines the outcome of protracted discussions between the City Municipality and Government began on the 10—12—1913 at a Commissioners' Meeting

One feature that strikes anyone who peruses these papers is that there could have been no possible thing within human conception prohibited on the localities in question unless it be the exercise of a citizen and taxpayers lawful primary and essential right of building a home for himself—particularly if he was not considered "worth while" by Municipality

After the order of August 1919 aforesaid the resident of the locality fondly believed that the dawn had come but it was not to be For the past fourteen years applications to the Municipality for permission to build or renovate houses in the Upparahalli and Dobbspet areas have met with either one of two endorsements (1) the improvement of the prohibited areas is under consideration and hence the applicant must wait (2) that the land on which permission to build is applied for is to be acquired by the Municipality for purposes of improvement and hence the application cannot be granted The mountain has been labouring all these years but not even the proverbial mouse has come forth Neither the scheme improvement nor the intended acquisition has yet matured In the meanwhile the residents of the place are fast disappearing either shifting for good from the areas in question while yet they have dear life in them or relieved by the merciful hand of death from the oppression of Local Self Government on earth and removed to the bliss of a One Man Rule above And their deserted homes to which they lovingly clung in life are crumbling into dust But who cares ? Men may come and men may go our Municipalities will go merrily on for ever and a day

But an event does happen once in a way even in ordinary mortals lives in this world which sets their hearts a flutter Such a one was the dramatic motion in the City Municipal Council one fine day in August 1931 moved by Mr W H Hanumanthappa and seconded by Mr S K Venkatarangaiengar that the

> ... licence applications for building be not refused on the ground that the site on which they intend building is within what is called prohibited areas as it is *ultra vires* of the powers of the Municipality to refuse on that ground (Vide The Daily Post Thursday Evening Aug 11th 1931

At the suggestion of Mr Venkatarangaiengar the House agreed to refer the matter to the Bye Law Committee for report before the next monthly meeting

The report is yet to come and the matter appears to have snugly buddled itself in the archives of the Municipality enjoying a refresher Will it ever wake up ?

Yours truly
PRO BONO PUBLICO
Bangalore City
20th Feb. 1933.

Our Ancient Ruins

As with Rip Van Winkle a time comes when our City Fathers awake and such an occasion did happen in August 1931 when a proposition was moved and seconded that the license applications for buildings be not refused on the ground that the site on which they intend building is within what is called the prohibited area as it is *ultra vires* of the powers of the Municipality to refuse on that ground The House agreed to refer the matter to the Bye Law Committee for report before the next monthly meeting This energetic activity on the part of the City Fathers was in connection with petitions received by the Bangalore City Municipality from the owners of properties in the Palace Upparahalli and Dobbspet areas within the Municipal limits of Bangalore City These poor people have been looking to the City Fathers to help them in the reconstruction of their delapidated homes. All they petitioned for was that the Bangalore City Municipality would reconstruct the area and give them permission to renew or rebuild their delapidated homes They are still waiting sanction We hear a great deal about Town Planning but apparently these high ideals in the cause of humanity get no further than the archives of the Municipality These ant eaten documents on which many insects have waxed fat have apparently been forgotten In the meantime many of the houses in the area under question are no more the residents of the place are fast disappearing either leaving for good while yet they have strength to go or clinging to their falling houses in the hope that the City Fathers will be moved by pity for their plight For the past fourteen years applications to the Municipality for permission to build or renovate houses in this area have met with either of two endorsements namely that improvements of the prohibited areas is under consideration and hence the applicant must wait or that the land on which permission to build is applied for is to be acquired by the Municipality for purposes of improvement and hence the application cannot be granted The report of the Bye Law Committee is still being typed by an ancient typist who has grown old in the services of the Municipality The archives like the Egyptian Tombs are harbouring much dust A new era is approaching the past is forgotten and the future actions of the City Fathers are unknown to the present generation of progressive people We hope they will clean out their archives and instead of living in the past live for the future

OUR ANCIENT RUINS

(TO THE EDITOR DAILY POST)

Dear Sir,—As the D v s on Coun cillor I was particularly delight d to find that you had devoted half a column n your ed tor al colum to vent late the grie an es o the res dents of the Palace Upparahalli and Dobbspet areas

Y ur corre pondent s perf ctly ju t fi d n adv cat g in as tro g l ngu ge as pos ble th c s of th i hab ta t Wh le I my lf do not wi h to hold any sp c al br f for th Mun ipal Counc l i a matter f th s k d I f l comp led o co r ct the mis tatement f f ct that the r port of the Bye law C mm tt e to which the matter was ref rred at my instance had yet to come

The Bye law Committ e submitted its repor to the Counc l to the effect that it is *ultra v res* of the powers of the Counc l und r the r gulat on or the Bye l ws in force to refu e l c ses to the appl cant in the said areas The Counc l apcept d the re porf of the Bye law Comm ttee Thus as far as the Cou c l is co cer ed it has o for ll d ss ciated ts lf with th acti n of the Munici pal Ex cutive in r fu ng l cense to bu ld

In th s as in several other matt rs the Co uncil i powerle s in ènfo ci g is re olut ons o the ab e e of g re pon ble execut ve The Mun c pal Commission r is as you are awa e a officer of the Go r me t wh o e se c s are le t to the M n c pal ty S mil rly the He lth Officer and th Mun c p l E g ee are l nt officers Th re ult has b n that in a m tter of this ki d h wev sympathet c hey may b they will not act contr ry to a *mamool* wh ch ha it r g n na old Ch f Comm s i Not fi ati n cl s fy l g c t i ar as as Prohib ted ar s Unm dful f th behest of the C u cil they the fo e content them elves w th merely forwarding the Coun il re olut ons to Government for reconsid at c and in the meanwhile is ue endo sements as of old

In th s state of aff rs the res dents of the local ties have to adopt one of two way v z e ther moving the Governm t o come to their rescue by endorsing the action of th Council; and modifying the Old Notification of the Ch ef Commiss ioner or in treating the endorsement of the Municipal Executive as of none effect in view of the Council's Resolution and courting a prosecution after putting up the struc ture They can thus vindicate their position as against the executive as on the legal grounds the Courts will [illegible] acquit them.

The residents can thus decide [illegible] they choose [illegible] with any [illegible] they

It is fortunate that you have backed the r cause a d I trust that the author t es will even at this late t ge i ze th t th p op r way i e ther to lio a i u é to pring up i th l ality o t l acq ire the ar a e th r ke p t open or lay it o it to a Exte s on af er the r ow cho ce

I hall r s rve to a later art cl the need f r a b ld and ge rous policy in this matter

Yours truly,

(S K VENKATRANGIENGAR)

As the Council has defi itely d s sociat d it elf from the action of the Mu ic pal Execu ve in r fus ng l censes to bu ld the m tt r ow r ts w th the Gov r m nt The res dents of the Pal c Upparahal and Dobbspet a eas must o k to the Government for relief (Ed)

Before - ~~Amin-ul-Mulk~~ Sir Mirza M Ismail Kt C.I.E. D.C.L. &c.
Dewan of Mysore.

~~In the Court of the~~

BANGALORE.

No _____ of 19

Memorialists B KRISHNASWAMY NAIDU & OTHERS.
Residents of Palace Upparahalli & Doddapet

Subject.- Re granting of building licences in the above areas
Vs.

I the memorialists above named do hereby appoint and retain ~~MESSRS. C. V. NARASIMHAIENGAR B.A., B.L., S. K. VEN KATARANGAIENGAR B.A., LL.B.~~ and T.S. LAKSHMINARASU B.A. B.L. Advocates to appear for ~~me~~ in the above ~~suit proceeding~~ petition ~~or appeal, and to conduct and prosecute or defend the same and all proceedings that may be taken in respect of any application for execution of any decree or order passed therein. I empower me Advocates to appear in all miscellaneous proceedings in the suit~~ or matter till all decrees or orders are fully satisfied or adjusted ~~to obtain the return of documents draw any moneys that may be payable to me in the said suit or matter, withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the suit, and take all other steps that they may deem proper in the matter And I undertake to ratify and confirm all legal acts done or caused to be done and to pay all fees costs, charges and expences which may be incurred by me said Advocates in the case by virtue of these presents~~

In witness whereof I have hereunder set my hand this 15th day of March 1933

Accepted

T Lakshminarasu

~~Advocates.~~

for memorialists.

Signed by the Executant
in my presence.

B Krishnaswamy Naidu

4		1	
5		2	
6		3	
7		4	
8		5	
9		6	
10		7	
11		8	
12		9	
13		10	
14		11	
15		12	
16		13	
17		14	
18		15	
19		16	
20		17	
21		18	
22		19	
23		20	
24		21	
25		22	
26		23	
27		24	
28		25	
29		26	
30		27	
31		28	
32		29	
33		30	
34		31	
35		32	
		33	
		34	
		35	
		36	

EMORIAL TO

ALI-UL-MULK

Sir Mirza M Ismail Kt

C I E O B E

Dewan of Mysore,

Bangalore

By

The Residents of Palace

Upparpalli and Doddapet

Bangalore City

Presented on 29th March 1933

Represented by

Mr S Jagannina Rau B A B L

Advocate

21, Old Post House Road

Bangalore City

MR 1-33-53

Office of the Secretary to Government
19 DEC
N 3901

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
Date of Receipt 19 12 33
Form Regr N 4135

To

3109

Amin-Ul-Mulk
Sir Mirza M Ismail, Kt, C I E, O B E,
Dewan of Mysore,
Bangalore

GENERAL DEV SECT
27 DEC 1933
L & G BRANCH

Hon'ble Member
Mr. Comptn

Respected Sir,

We, the undersigned residents of Upperhalli and Dobspet beg to state that we interviewed your honour regarding the improvements to Upperhalli and submitted our representation on 25th March 1933 You were kind enough to promise that you would refer the matter to His Highness the Maharaja and give instructions to the Municipal authorities in the matter So far nothing has been done to improve the extension

We beg to bring to your notice that Municipality is refusing to grant licenses to get houses repaired to In one instance where the building is in such a dangerous condition that it will fall upon the inmates of the house, at any time, license to get it rebuilt is not granted There are many instances of the kind Government should either decide to take over the village or grant licenses to rebuild the houses and to repair them when necessity arises Such of those who are bold have rebuilt their houses to their taste Only those who are honest and want the co-operation of Government in the matter are the persons who had suffered

We therefore humbly request your honour to call for the files of papers which have been pending for a long number of years and give instructions to the authorities concerned to dispose of the same as early as possible

Yours obedient servants

long and made bold to approach you again as we know, that you are always interested to do good to the loyal subjects of His Highness and in the town improvement During your administration many villages which have been neglected for a long time have been improved It is a pity that we were unfortunate to get your sympathy which we still hope that your sympathy will be directed on us by appealing to you We request your honour to inspect the village with the Commissioner and Councillors at an early opportunity and to study the exact position and redress the grievances of the people whose position is entirely left in your statesmanship hands

Ever be grateful to your honour

We beg to remain,
Respected Sir,
Your most obedient servants,

Sir,

I have the honour to forward herewith the Annual Report on the Working of the Co-operative Societies in the Madras Presidency for the year 1929-30. The year under review is the first year of the working of the Madras Co-operative Societies Act, 1932 which came into force with effect from 1-11-1932. The Report for 1930-31 which was under preparation when the new Act came into force, was also prepared on the basis of the old Act and was published in the beginning of 1932. The Report for the year 1931-32 is under preparation and will be published shortly. The Report for the year 1932-33 will be prepared on the basis of the new Act and will be published in the beginning of 1934.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
K. Ramakrishna Rao
Joint Registrar

27/10/1934

To
The Secretary to Govt.
Development Department,
Madras.

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ದಿನಾಂಕ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಸ್ಥಳ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಪ್ರಕಾರ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಮತ್ತು ದಿನಾಂಕ	ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯ ಹೆಸರು	ಪ್ರಕಟಣೆಯ ಸ್ಥಳ	ಷರಾ
ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಸಂ. ಮತ್ತು ದಿನಾಂಕ	" ಸಂಜೆ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆ ಸಂ	34	1933 ಆಕ್ಟೋಬರ್ 500 ರಿಂದ 500 ಕ್ಕೆ ಏರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ

K Thimmappa
Tax Inspector
27/10/34

క్ర.సం	వస్తువు పేరు	విడిపేరు	కొలత సంఖ్య	గమనిక
1	పెట్టెలు	ఒక్కొక్కటి	1	
2	ఇత్తడి కొలుపుకర్ర		7	
3	కొలిచ్చి పెట్టేవి		120	
4	పీట తక్కెడ		21	
5	కొలుపు బల్ల		25	
7	అయిదేరు కొలుపులు		26	
8	ఇనుప గిన్నె		29	
9	కాళ్ళ గిన్నె		41	
10	ఇత్తడి కొలుపు గిన్నె		48	
11	చిన్న ఇత్తడి కలువ		49	
12	పెద్ద గిన్నె	పాలు పోసే గిన్నె	53	
13	కొలుపు గిన్నె		65	

K Dhanalakshmi
Tax inspector
27/10/82

Capitalized value @ 16⅔ times	Amount	Remarks —
	16793 - 0 - 0	
10 × 5/6 × 50/3	556 - 0 - 0	
30 × 5/6 × 50/3	417 - 0 - 0	
60 × 5/6 × 50/3	834 - 0 - 0	
25 × 5/6 × 50/3	348 - 0 - 0	
00 × 5/6 × 50/3	1390 - 0 - 0	
00 × 5/6 × 50/3	1390 - 0 - 0	
80 × 5/6 × 50/3	1112 - 0 - 0	
30 × 5/6 × 50/3	417 - 0 - 0	
40 × 5/6 × 50/3	556 - 0 - 0	
50 × 5/6 × 50/3	695 - 0 - 0	

30 × 5/6 × 50/3	417 - 0 - 0
100 × 5/6 × 50/3	695 - 0 - 0
40 × 5/6 × 50/3	556 - 0 - 0
50 × 5/6 × 50/3	695 - 0 - 0
60 × 5/6 × 50/3	834 - 0 - 0
50 × 5/6 × 50/3	695 - 0 - 0
50 × 5/6 × 50/3	695 - 0 - 0
180 × 5/6 × 50/3	2500 - 0 - 0
25 × 5/6 × 50/3	348 - 0 - 0
75 × 5/6 × 50/3	1042 - 0 - 0
30 × 5/6 × 50/3	417 - 0 - 0
150 × 5/6 × 50/3	2083 - 0 - 0
75 × 5/6 × 50/3	1042 - 0 - 0
40 × 5/6 × 50/3	556 - 0 - 0
35 × 5/6 × 50/3	486 - 0 - 0

Valuation Statement Shown

Dodda Appa

S No	Street	Door No	Name of owner	Description of property
1	Dodda Appanahally Main road	1 & 2	B Krishnaswamy Naidu	Mangalore tiled building
2		3	G R Krishnaswamy Naidu	— do —
3		4	Khadar Sab	— do —
4		4	Habi Nabi	Country tiled building
5		3	Gollappa Munivenkatappa	do —
6		4	G R Krishnaswamy Naidu	Thatched Sheds
7	I Cross road	5, 6 & 7	Dodda Thayappa	Mud roofed building
8		8 & 9	Munimallappa	Thatched Shed
9		10 & 11	B Krishnaswamy Naidu	— do —
10		12	Salaiamma	Country tiled building
11		13	Krishnaswamy Naidu	Mangalore tiled building
12		14	Abdul Rahiman Saheb	Mud roofed building
13		15	Masamba	Country tiled building
14		16	Munivenkatappa	Mangalore tiled
15		17 & 18	Krishnaswamy Naidu	— do —
16	II Cross road	1	Thayamma	Mangalore tiled building
17		2	Penimeah	Mud roofed & mangalore tile
18		3	Sakinabi	Mangalore tiled building
19		4	Ramachar	— do —
20		5, 6 & 7	Chikka Thayamma	Mud roofed building
21		8 & 9	Thaval Saheb	Mud roofed
22		10	— do —	Country tiled building
23		11 & 12	Rangappa	— do —
24		13	Rahiman Khan Saheb	Mangalore tiled building

The properties to be acquired in Shalby –

Annual Rental Value	Capitalized Value @ 16 2/3 times	Amount	Remarks
100-0-0	100 x 5/6 x 50/3	1390-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
50-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
40-0-0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556-0-0	
50-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
25-0-0	25 x 5/6 x 50/3	348-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
25-0-0	25 x 5/6 x 50/3	348-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
100-0-0	100 x 5/6 x 50/3	1390-0-0	
20-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	348-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
100-0-0	100 x 5/6 x 50/3	1390-0-0	
100-0-0	100 x 5/6 x 50/3	1390-0-0	
50-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
100-0-0	100 x 5/6 x 50/3	1390-0-0	
30-0-0	30 x 5/6 x 50/3	417-0-0	
50-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
60-0-0	60 x 5/6 x 50/3	834-0-0	
65-0-0	65 x 5/6 x 50/3	903-0-0	
[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	

S No	Street	Door No	Name of owner	Description of property	Annual Rental Value
25	II Cross west	14	Chekka Thayamma	Thatched	40-0-0
26		17 18+19	Munimallappa	✓ Mud roofed building	30 0 0
27		20	Lingappa	✓ Mangalore tiled hg	60-0-0
28		21	Rangalakkamma	✓ — do —	25-0-0
29	X	1	Thavakalsab	✓ Mud roofed building	100-0-0
30		5&6	Munivenkatappa	T R/M T	100-0-0
31		7 8+9	Chekkamma	✓ Mud roofed building	80-0-0
32		10+11	Munisamappa	M T & M ~~Red~~ roof	30-0-0
33		14	Dodda Thayappa	✓ Mud roof & Country tiled	40-0-0
34	III Cross west	15	Chekka Thayappa	✓ Mud roofed building	50-0-0
35	X	1 to 4	P Malleah	Thatched & mud roof	30-0-0
36		5	Mallappa	✓ Mud roofed building	100-0-0
37		6	Eraehandappa	✓ do —	40-0-0
38		10	Manckyam	✓ Mangalore tiled & M R	50-0-0
39	IV Cross west	12	Munidavappa	✓ Mud roofed building	60-0-0
40		14	D Thayappa	✓ Mud roofed	50-0-0
41		15	Yesman Khan	✓ — do —	50-0-0
42		16	Munivenkatappa	✓ Mangalore tiled hg	180-0-0
43		18	Ayappa	✓ Mud roofed building	20-0-0
44		18/1	Thayappa	✓ Mangalore tiled	75-0-0
45		19	AKKayamma	✓ Mud roofed	30-0-0
46		20	Chekkathayappa	✓ Mangalore tiled	150-0-0
47		21	Munimanna	✓ Mud roofed	75-0-0
48		22	C V Ranganayakamma	✓ — do —	40-0-0
49		23	Sheik Hussain	✓ Country tiled	35

Sl	S No	Street	Door No	Name of Owner	Description of Property
-					
	50	IV Cross Road	24	Lakkappa	Mangalore tiled building
	57		26	— do —	do - & M R
1					
2	52		3	Parvathamma	Country tiled building
-			4	Gnana prakasam	Mud roofed building
2			576	Syed Ibrahim Saheb	— do —
			718+9	Thayappa	- do -
2					
3		IV Cross Road			

Annual Rental Value	Capitalized Value @ 16⅔ times	Amount	Remarks
		3752, -0	
40 -0 -0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556 -0 -0	
50 -0 -0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695 0 0	Abstract
			1) magalore tiles buildings 27
			2) mud mogues " 31
50 -0 -0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695 -0 0	3) Thatched sheds " 8
175 -0 -0	175 x 5/6 x 50/3	2432 -0 -0	4) Country tiled bgs 6
50 -0 -0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695 -0 -0	5) Vacant sites 16
20 -0 -0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278 -0 -0	
	Total Rupees	42920 -0 -0	

V S Ramgachala
Srv 17/3/36

BJS Narasinga
17/3/36

Annual Rental Value	Capitalised value @ 16 2/3 times	Amount	Remarks
		19 945-0-0	
1-0-0	25 x 5/6 x 50/3	348-0-0	
1-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	
1-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	Abstract —
1-0-0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556 0 0	
			1) Mangalore tiled buildings 29
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	2) Mud roofed 13
1-0-0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556-0-0	3) Thatched sheds 5
1-0-0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556-0-0	4) Country tiled bgs - 6
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	5) Zinc sheet roofed bg - 1
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	6 Vacant sites 13
1-0-0	20 x 5/6 x 50/3	278-0-0	
1-0-0	50 x 5/6 x 50/3	695-0-0	
1-0-0	40 x 5/6 x 50/3	556-0-0	
	Total Rupees	26,270-0-0	

V I Ramgachalam
Srw 17/3/36

SJS Nwe Surg
17/3/36

Valuation Statement showing the properties

BS no	Street	Door no	Name of owner --	Description of property
1	Chikkapparakally main road	2	Annayappa	/ Mangalore tiled building
2		3	Papaiah	/ Mud roof & Mangalore tiled
3		4 & 5	Gnappa	/ Mud roofed building
4		6, 7 & 8	Munivenkatappa & Chennamma	/ Thatched Sheds & M T
5		10	Munivenkatappa	/ Mangalore tiled building
6		11	Thimmarayappa	/ Thatched Shed
7		12	Manakka	/ Country tiled building
8		13	Venkatappa	do —
9		14, 15 & 16	Munivenkatappa	/ Mud roofed & Thatched
10		17	Hanumakka	/ Mangalore tiled building
11		18	Munnyappa	/ Mangalore tiled & zinc
12		21	Kempaiah	/ Mud roofed building
13		22 & 23	Munisamappa	/ Country tiled building
14		27	Iyappa	zinc sheet roofed bu
15		31	Gundappa	/ Country tiled building
16		32	Rangasamy	/ Mangalore tiled building
17		30	Marappa	/ Mangalore tiled bui
18		33 & 34	Venkatappa	/ do —
19		35	Munithimmaiah	/ Mud roof & Mangalore ti
20		36	Chennamma	/ Mangalore tiled bui
21		37	Hangappa	/ Country tiled bu
22		38	" do —	/ Mangalore tiled
23		39	Munivenkatappa	/ ~~M~~ T ~~B~~ M T
24		40	Kempaiah	/ Mangalore tiled bui
25		45	Chennarayappa	/ do —
26		46	Munivenkatappa	/ Mud roofed buildi
27		47	Munipapamma	/ do & Country til
28		50	Subbamma	/ Country tiled bu
29		51	Seddarasappa	/ Mangalore tiled bui
30		52	Krishnappa	/ — do —
31		54	Narasamma	Mud roofed bu

S no	Street	Door Nos	Name of owner	Description of property
~~32~~ ~~55~~	Chikkaiah Seppanahally Main road	55	Venkalasamappa	Thatched Shed
33		56 & 57	Munivenkalappa	Mangalore tiled Building
		58	Chennarayappa	do —
		59	Gnappa	— do —
		60	Thirumalappa	Mud roofed building
		61 & 62	D Munyappa	do — & Mangalore tiled
		63	Thirumalappa & Kalappa	Mangalore tiles & Country tiles
		63/1	Thirumalappa	do —
		64	— do —	do
		66	Sya Saheb	— do —
		67	Jafer Sab	— do —
		68 & 69	Nagappa	— do —
		70-71	do -	— do -
		72	Kuppaswamy	— do —

Add

particulars	Mangalore tiled buildings	Mud wattle buildings	Thatched Sheds	Country tiled buildings	Zinc Sheet buildings	Vacant Sites	Amount	Remarks
Madda Uppanahally	24	31	8	6	-	16	42,920-0-0	
Chekka Uppanahally	29	13	5	6	1	13	26,270-0-0	
Add for vacant sites & Thatched sheds which have no number Lumpsum							3810-0-0	
			Total Rupees				73,000-0-0	
Add 15% Statutory allowances							10950-0-0	
			Grand Total Rupees				83,950	or Rs 84,000/-

V S Ranganachalam
Sub-overseer 17/3/36

BJ Navalgund 17/3/36
Municipal Engineer

City Municipal Office

No L Dis R1 Gl 6526/36-37 *Bangalore, dated* 3rd. December 1936

2607

From

M SESHADRI ESQ M A
Municipal Commissioner,
Bangalore City

To

B T Yesavaiengar, Esq , B A ,
Chief Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
Bangalore

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of file of papers relating to the improvement of Dobbspet and Upparahalli. Bangalore city, returned with your letter No L 3707 dated 20th November 1936

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

M Seshadri
Municipal Commissioner

M M)

S167 P32

DEWAN'S MINUTE

FILE No

192

GENERAL SECRETARIAT No 4156

DIWAN'S SECTT GEN 4156 25 MAR

L S G BRANCH

General Secretary

I attach a petition presented to me this morning on behalf of the residents of Upparhalli, Bangalore

a) The present position is not satisfactory from the point of view of either the Palace or the Municipality or the residents of the locality

(1) Is it legally possible to prohibit construction of new houses, or even repairing of existing houses?

(2) The easiest and safest course would, perhaps, be for the Palace to acquire the lands and keep them in their possession How far that would be possible is a matter for the Palace to consider

(3) Can we suggest any other way out of the difficulty?

25 3 33

Secy

25/3/33 – Please perhaps lots with papers

Nov 25/3

(Mdy 260-129 and other papers) The connected file on the subject is put up as directed

25/3/33

W The proviso draft in clause 116 of the City Municipal Bill enables the Municipality to acquire and construct or lands for the purpose of repairing existing buildings

Law

on the draft issued

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat L. C

No. L 370 (in one file) — *Dated Bangalore* ~~13th~~ November 1936

From

The *Chief Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Myso e*

To

The Municipal Commissioner,

Bangalore City Municipality, Bangalore

Sir

I am directed to return herewith your office file of papers relating to the improvement of Dobbspet and Upparahalli, Bangalore City, and to request that the receipt of the same may kindly be acknowledged

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

(Issued draft) — for Chief Secretary to Government

Aga/2-

Appendix F G—1]

SUBJECT

Diary No of letter r plied to

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193*

Date of issue 22/11/36

Signed by

List of enclosures

Copied by

ied by

Section 2nd

File No 37-36

Serial No 107

No 1870

To

The Municipal Commr,
Bangalore city

Sir,

I am directed to return herewith your office file of papers relating to the improvement of Dobbspet and Yelahanka and to request that Bangalore city & the receipt of the same may kindly be acknowledged

I have etc

22/11/36

for Chief Secy to Govt

Rmr

WD 09991—GPB—30,000—23-9-35